UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PLAINTIFF VS. NO. 3:21CR107 JAMARR SMITH, THOMAS IROKO AYODELE, AND GILBERT McTHUNEL, II DEFENDANTS TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE AND OXFORD, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) COURT Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655	1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI OXFORD DIVISION		
VS. NO. 3:21CR107 JAMARR SMITH, THOMAS IROKO AYODELE, AND GILBERT McTHUNEL, II DEFENDANTS TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL YOUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PLAINTIFF		
JAMARR SMITH, THOMAS IROKO AYODELE, AND GILBERT McTHUNEL, II DEFENDANTS TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL YOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655				
JAMARR SMITH, THOMAS IROKO AYODELE, AND GILBERT McTHUNEL, II DEFENDANTS TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655	5	VS. NO. 3:21CR107		
JAMARR SMITH, THOMAS IROKO AYODELE, AND GILBERT McTHUNEL, II DEFENDANTS TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655	6			
TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655		JAMARR SMITH, THOMAS IROKO AYODELE, AND GILBERT MCTHUNEL II DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS	
TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655		THE STEELY HOTHONEE, II		
TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5 OF 5 BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655				
BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655		TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL		
BEFORE HONORABLE SHARION AYCOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655		VOLUME 5 OF 5		
Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655				
Oxford, Mississippi February 24, 2023 (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East Oxford, MS 38655		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
(APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) (APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN) Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655		Oxford, Mississippi		
(APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN)		February 24, 2023		
(APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN)	16	(APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN)		
20 21 22 Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655	17			
20 21 22 Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655	18	, ————————————————————————————————————		
Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655	19			
Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655	20			
Court Reporter: PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655	21		ECDD CCD #1225	
Federal Official Court Reporter 911 Jackson Avenue East 0xford, MS 38655	22	Court Papartor: DUVILIE / Mal APTY DMD ECDD CCD #1225		
0xford, MS 38655	23	Federal Official Court Reporter	porter	
25	24			
	25			

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For the Government:	ROBERT J. MIMS, Esquire CLYDE McGEE, IV, Esquire
3		U.S. Attorney's Office 900 Jefferson Avenue
4		0xford, MS 38655
5	For the Defendant	COODLOE T LEWIS Forwing
6	Smith:	GOODLOE T. LEWIS, Esquire Hickman, Goza & Spragins, PLLC
7		P.O. Drawer 668 Oxford, MS 38655-0668
8	For the Defendant Ayodele:	WILLIAM E TRAVIS Equipo
9		WILLIAM F. TRAVIS, Esquire 8619 Highway 51 North Southaven, MS 38671
10	For the Defendant	Southaven, no soor i
11	McThunel:	PAUL A. CHINICHE, Esquire Chiniche Law Firm, PLLC
12		P.O. Box 1202 Oxford, MS 38655-1202
13		oxioi a, ile cecco i zez
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

(CALL TO ORDER OF THE COURT AT 9:35 A.M.)

THE COURT: Before we bring the jury in, a couple of things. I thought about the issue that we raised, and the clerks have done some research. So my gut feeling is kind of confirmed by this case law, and that is this, is that the defendant should be entitled to make the defense and to argue the defense they want to argue.

We did find a case. That's *United States of America* versus Mary Ann Lara, L-a-r-a. It is a Fifth Circuit 2022 case. This was in reference to some comments that the prosecutor had made during opening statements, but it says, "An attorney is entitled to urge the conclusions which the attorney thinks the jury should draw from the evidence." And it goes on to state that, "In doing so" -- and in this case, it was the Government -- "the Government has some -- asked some rhetorical questions in opening that are inferential in substance." And that was permissible.

So we have some evidence in this case that the jury might infer regarding Brown and -- I'm sorry. The other name I don't recall right now.

MR. MIMS: Hines, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. So, yes, we -- you will be allowed to argue that. Now --

MR. CHINICHE: Your Honor, there -- there may be others other than those two.

THE COURT: It may be. 1 MR. CHINICHE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 2 I didn't mean to limit it to THE COURT: Uh-huh. 3 that, but those are the two that I think we touched on the 4 most. 5 I'm going to attempt to read these jury instructions 6 this morning. Last week I did not. I asked the attorneys' 7 permission to allow a law clerk to read them. If I start 8 coughing a lot, it's more distracting for them to hear me 9 coughing. Then they don't hear the instruction. 10 MR. MIMS: Your Honor, I'll tell you on the front end 11 for the Government, we have no objection to that. 12 **THE COURT:** Okay. Is that okay with y'all? 13 MR. CHINICHE: No objection. 14 No objection. MR. LEWIS: 15 MR. TRAVIS: No objection, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: This has been Ms. Natalie's case, and 17 she's prepared. And I'm going to start, and I hope I get 18 through it, but I don't want to be distracting. 19 20 Okay. Let's bring in the jury. MR. LEWIS: We need to rest. 21 THE COURT: Oh, thank you. Just one second. Just one 22 second. Do you want to do that in the presence of the jury? 23 MR. CHINICHE: Yes, Your Honor. 24 MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor. 25

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 1 (JURY IN.) 2 **THE COURT:** You may have a seat. 3 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome back 4 to Friday morning, and I hope that you had a good night's rest 5 and are now ready to listen to jury instructions and closing 6 arguments. Again, I anticipate you'll get this case today 7 around noon. 8 Okay. So I've cleared this with the lawyers. I'm about to read to you the jury instructions. 10 MR. CHINICHE: Your Honor --11 THE COURT: Yes. Thank you. 12 MR. CHINICHE: -- if I may, on behalf of Mr. McThunel, 13 Mr. McThunel would rest his case. 14 **THE COURT:** Thank you. 15 MR. LEWIS: Jamarr Smith rests. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. 17 MR. TRAVIS: May it please the Court. Your Honor, on 18 behalf of Mr. Ayodele, defense rests. 19 20 THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you. Confirming what I told you yesterday, no further 21 testimony. 22 I'm going to attempt to read you these jury 23 instructions. I've been coughing. I don't want my cough to 24 distract you from being able to hear this. So if I start 25

coughing -- I've already got preclearance from them -- I'm going to hand it off to a clerk, Ms. Natalie Lowry, who's been working on this case. And she's simply going to go to the podium and read them to you as if they were my instructions. Okav?

Members of the jury: In any jury trial, there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges. The other is the jury. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to decide what evidence is proper for your consideration. It is also my duty at the end of the trial to explain to you the rules of law that you must follow in applying -- in arriving at your verdict.

First, I will give you some general instructions which apply in every case, for example, instructions about the burden of proof and how a judge -- how to judge the believability of witnesses. Then I will give you some specific rules of law about this particular case, and, finally, I will explain to you the procedures that you'll use in your deliberations.

You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts. But in determining what actually happened, that is, in reaching your decisions as to the facts, it is your sworn duty to follow all of the rules of law as I have explained them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction or to question the wisdom or the correctness of any rule that I state to you. You must not

substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors, and they have the right to expect nothing less.

The indictment or formal charge against the defendant is not evidence of guilt. Indeed, all defendants are presumed by the law to be innocent. The defendants begin with a clean slate. The law does not require the defendants to prove their innocence or to produce any evidence at all, and no inference whatsoever may be drawn from the election of the defendants not to testify.

The Government has the burden of proving the defendants guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. And if it fails to do so as to any defendant, you must acquit that defendant. While the Government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that the defendants' guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the Government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the defendants' guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all

As I told you earlier, it is my duty to determine --

of the evidence in the case. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof to such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in making some of the most important decisions of your own affairs.

In considering the evidence, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which have been established by the evidence.

Do not be concerned about whether evidence is direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. You should consider and weigh the evidence that was presented to you.

Direct evidence is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness.

Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of events and

circumstances indicating that something is or is not a fact.

The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. But the law requires that you have to weigh all of the evidence, whether direct or circumstantial, be convinced of the guilt of the defendants beyond a reasonable doubt before you can find them guilty.

it is your duty to determine the facts. To do so, you must consider only the evidence presented during the trial. Evidence is a sworn -- evidence is the sworn testimony of the witnesses, including stipulations, and exhibits. The questions, statements, objections, and arguments made by the lawyers are not evidence.

The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant or most helpful to their side of the case and, in doing so, to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that may otherwise escape your notice. In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls the case. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you.

During the trial, I sustained objections to certain questions and exhibits. You must disregard those questions entirely. Do not speculate as to what the witness would have said if permitted to answer the question. Also, certain testimony or other evidence has been ordered stricken from the record, and you have been instructed to disregard that evidence. Do not consider any testimony or other evidence which has been removed from your consideration in reaching your decision. Your verdict must be based solely upon the legally admissible evidence and testimony.

Also, do not assume anything I have said or done during the trial or -- that I have -- don't assume that I have

any opinion concerning any of the issues in this case. Except for the instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own verdict.

I remind you that it is your job to decide whether the Government has proved -- has proved the guilt of the defendants beyond a reasonable doubt. In so doing, you must consider all of the evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept all of the evidence as true or accurate.

You are the sole judges of the credibility or believability of each witness and the weight to be given to that witness's testimony. An important part of your job will be making judgments about the testimony of the witnesses who testified in this case. You should decide whether you believe all, some part of, or none of each person -- what each person had to say and how important that testimony was.

In making the decision, I suggest that you ask yourself a few questions. Did the witness impress you as honest? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness have any relationship with either the Government or the defense? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness clearly see or hear the things about which he or she testified? Did the witness have an opportunity and ability to understand the

questions clearly and answer them directly? Did the witness's testimony differ from the witness's of other -- testimony of other witnesses? These are just a few of the considerations that might help you in determining the accuracy.

Your job is to think about the testimony of each witness you have heard and decide how much you believe of what that witness had to say. In making up your mind and in reaching a verdict, do not make any decisions simply because there were more witnesses on one side than on the other side. Do not reach a conclusion on a particular point just because there were more witnesses testifying about that point. You will always keep -- always bear in mind that the law never imposes upon the defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence.

You are here to decide whether the Government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants are guilty of the charge -- of the crimes charged. The defendants are not on trial for any act, conduct, or offense not alleged in the indictment. Neither are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as defendants in this case.

The defendants have an absolute right not to testify.

The fact that the defendants did not testify cannot be considered by you in any way or even discussed in your deliberations.

I remind you that it is up to the Government to prove each defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. It is not up to the defendants to prove their innocence.

A separate crime is charged against each of the defendants in each count of the indictment. Each count and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The case of each defendant should be considered separately and individually. The fact that you may find one or more of the accused guilty or not guilty of any of the crimes charged should not control your verdict as to any other crime or any other defendant. You must give separate consideration to the evidence to each defendant.

In any criminal case, the Government must prove not only the essential elements of the offense or offenses charged but must also prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, the identity of the defendants as the perpetrators of the alleged offense. In evaluating the identification testimony of a witness, you should consider all of the factors already mentioned concerning your assessment of the credibility of each witness in general, and you should also consider whether the witness had an adequate opportunity to observe the person in question at the time or times upon which the witness testified.

You may consider all matters, including the length of time the witness had to observe the person in question, the prevailing conditions at the time in terms of visibility or

distance and the like, and whether the witness had known or observed the person in earlier times. You may also consider the circumstances surrounding the identification itself, including, for example, the manner in which the defendants were presented to the witness for identification and the length of time that lapsed between the incident in question and the next opportunity the witness had to observe the defendants.

If, after examining all of the testimony and evidence in the case, you have a reasonable doubt as to the identity of the defendants as the perpetrators of the offense charged, you must find the defendants not guilty.

The indictment charges the defendants with robbery of a person having lawful charge, custody, or control of any mail matter or money and, in doing so, putting that person's life in jeopardy by use of a dangerous weapon. In order for you to find the defendants guilty of this charge, the Government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

Number one, the defendants took mail matter, money, or property of the United States from the person or presence of Sylvester Cobbs, having lawful charge, custody, or control of such property; number two, the defendants took such property by means of force and violence or by means of intimidation; and, number three, the defendants put the life of Sylvester Cobbs in jeopardy by using the dangerous weapon.

If you find from your consideration of all of the

evidence that the Government has proved each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendants guilty of that charge.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all of the evidence that the Government has failed to prove any one of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendants not guilty of the charge.

Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, makes it a crime for two or more persons to conspire to commit an offense against the laws of the United States.

The defendants are charged with conspiring to rob a person having lawful charge, control, or custody of any mail matter or money by use of a dangerous weapon.

A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to join together to accomplish some unlawful purpose. It is kind of a "partnership in crime" in which each member of the conspiracy becomes the agent of every other member.

For you to find the defendants guilty of this crime, you must be convinced that the Government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: Number one, that a defendant and at least one other person agreed to commit the robbery of a person having lawful charge, custody, or control of any mail matter or money by use of a dangerous weapon, as it's charged in the indictment; and, number two, that the

defendants knew the unlawful purpose of the agreement and joined in it willfully, that is, with intent to further the unlawful purpose; and, number three, that at least one of the conspirators during the evidence -- existence of the conspiracy knowingly committed at least one of the overt acts described in the indictment in order to accomplish such object or purpose of the conspiracy.

The overt act need not be of a criminal nature as long as it is done in furtherance of the conspiracy.

One may become a member of a conspiracy without knowing all of the details of the unlawful scheme or the identities of all of the other alleged conspirators. If a particular defendant understands the unlawful nature of a plan or scheme and knowingly and intentionally joins in that plan or scheme on one occasion, that is sufficient to convict them for conspiracy even though that particular defendant had not participated before or even after through the particular defendant -- though the defendant -- let me reread that, please -- even though the particular defendant had not participated before and even though that particular defendant played only a minor part.

The Government does not need to prove that the alleged conspirators entered into any formal agreement or that they directly stated between themselves all of the details of the scheme. Likewise, the Government does not need to prove that

all of the details of the scheme alleged in the indictment were actually agreed upon or carried out, nor must it prove that all of the persons alleged to have been members of the conspiracy were such or that the alleged conspirators actually succeeded in accomplishing their unlawful objectives.

Mere presence at the scene of an event, even with knowledge that a crime is being committed, or the mere fact that certain persons may have associated with each other and may have assembled together and discussed common aims and interests does not necessarily establish proof of the existence of a conspiracy. Also, a person who has no knowledge of a conspiracy but who happens to act in a way which advances some purposes of the conspiracy does not thereby become a coconspirator.

The guilt of any defendant in a criminal case may be established without proof that the defendant personally did every act constituting the alleged offense. The act -- the law recognizes that ordinarily anything a person can do for himself may also be accomplished by him through the direction of another person as his agent or by acting in concert with or under the direction of another person or persons in a joint effort or enterprise.

If another person is acting under the direction of a defendant or if a defendant joins another person and performs acts with the intent to commit a crime, then the law holds that

defendant responsible for the acts and conduct of each -- of such other persons just as though the defendants had committed the acts or engaged in such conduct.

Before any defendant may be held criminally responsible for the acts of others, it is necessary that the accused deliberately associate himself in some way with the crime and participate in it with the intent to bring about the crime.

Mere presence at the scene of a crime and knowledge that a crime is being committed are not sufficient to establish that the defendant either directed or aided and abetted the crime unless you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants were participants and not merely a knowing spectator.

In other words, you may not find any defendant guilty unless you find beyond a reasonable doubt that every element of the offense as defined in these instructions was committed by some person or persons and that particular defendant voluntarily participated in its commission with the intent to violate the law.

For you to find any defendant guilty of this crime, you must be convinced that the Government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: Number one, that the offense of robbery of a person having lawful charge, control, or custody of any mail matter or money by the use of a

1

5

6

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

2425

dangerous weapon was committed by some person; that the defendant associated with the criminal venture; that the defendant purposefully participated in the criminal venture; and, fourth, that the defendant sought by action to make the venture successful.

"To associate with the criminal venture" means that the defendants shared the criminal intent of the principal. This element cannot be established if the defendants had no knowledge of the principal's criminal venture.

"To participate in the criminal venture" means that the defendants engaged in some affirmative action -- conduct designed to aid the venture or assist the principal of the crime.

The word "knowingly," as that term has been used from time to time in these instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally, not by mistake or accident.

During the trial, you have heard the testimony of Christopher Moody, who expressed opinions concerning cell site and geolocation historical location services. If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify and state an opinion concerning such matters.

Merely because a witness has expressed an opinion does

not mean, however, that you must accept this opinion. You should judge such testimony like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it and give it such weight -- or give it such weight as you think it deserves considering the witness's experience and education, the soundness of the reasons given for the opinion, and all other evidence in the case.

If the defendants are found guilty, it will be my duty to decide what the punishment should be. You should not be concerned about the punishment in any way. It should not enter your discussions or your deliberations.

To reach a verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, all of you must agree. Your verdict must be unanimous on each count of the indictment. Your deliberations will be in secret. You will never have to explain your verdict to anyone.

It is your duty to consult with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement if you can do so. Each of you must decide the case for yourself but only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors. During your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own opinions and change your mind if convinced you were wrong. But do not give up your honest beliefs as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinions of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times, you are judges -- judges of the

4 5

facts. Your duty is to decide whether the Government has proved the defendants guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

So when you go to the jury room, the first thing that you're going to do is decide among yourselves who will serve as the foreperson. That person will help you guide your deliberations and will speak for you, if necessary, here in the courtroom.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience. And for that matter, all of these instructions will go back with you; so you may read them -- reread them at your convenience.

The foreperson will write the unanimous answer of the jury in the space provided for each count of the indictment, whether guilty or not guilty. At the conclusion of your deliberations, the foreperson should date and sign the verdict.

If you need to communicate with me at anytime during your deliberations, the foreperson should write the message, give it to the court security officer. I'll either, one, reply in writing to you, or I will bring you back here in the courtroom to speak to your message.

Bear in mind that you are never to reveal to any person, not even this Court, how the jury stands numerically or otherwise on any count of the indictment until after you have reached a unanimous verdict.

I know you can't see the jury form from this distance

probably, but let me tell you it lays out for you each defendant and then each count. It's very easy to follow. So you're just going to simply take, for instance, Count 1 as to Mr. Smith and write guilty or not guilty, and then Count 2, guilty or not guilty. And you have a form for each of the defendants.

As I indicated, a copy of the indictment will be included in the instructions and will go back with you to the jury room.

So I'm going to allow them to start their closing statements. And just for the record, it's probably going to be about -- you know, it's 10:10. It's going to be about 10:15 when they get started. These closing statements are a little lengthy. I'm not -- because they need to be. There's a lot of testimony in this case. It's going to take a while for them to summarize that for you.

I just want to let you know that, if you need to take a break during this time, raise your hand, let me know.

Otherwise, just for continuity, I'm going to go through all of the closing statements this morning and try to complete them.

But I don't want you to sit there uncomfortable if you do need to take a break.

I'm going to go ahead and speak to you just a moment about the exhibits that will go back with you. We will make arrangements for you to have access to any of the videos or any

of the documents -- all of the documents you'll have, but IT can assist you in the jury room, if necessary.

So I would invite you to listen very carefully now to the closing -- closing arguments.

Mr. Mims.

Because the Government has the burden in the case, what you're going to find procedurally here is we'll start with the Government. Then I'll call upon each of the defendants to make their closing, and then Mr. McGee for the Government will summarize and have the last word because the Government has the burden.

MR. MIMS: Good morning.

JURORS: Morning.

MR. MIMS: On February 5th, 2018, Gilbert McThunel, acting together with Jamarr Smith and Roko Ayodele, beat Sylvester Cobbs with a pistol and stole \$60,000 from the U.S. Postal Service.

Now, earlier this week when Mr. Lewis was making his opening statement, he made a comment to you that the Government cannot produce any real evidence in this case. Let's talk about the real evidence the Government has produced.

First, we have a video that shows the entire robbery. From that video, you can see that there are three people of interest that were actually at the scene committing this robbery. You have the assailant. You have the person driving

the white SUV who dropped off the assailant and later appeared to come back after the robbery to pick up the assailant. And you have the person driving the red Hyundai who followed the postal truck to the scene and hung around appearing to act as a lookout.

You have Google location information from the first search warrant, the geofence warrant, which places Gilbert McThunel and Jamarr Smith at the scene of the crime at the Lake Cormorant post office at the time of the robbery.

You have additional Google location information from the second Google search warrant, which shows an expanded view of McThunel's and Smith's location. And it shows them traveling from their homes in Batesville middle of the afternoon, up the interstate, and across from Hernando over to Lake Cormorant, hanging out in the Lake Cormorant/Robinsonville area for a couple of hours before and during the time of the robbery, and then returning back to Batesville after the robbery.

You have cell tower location data separate from Google location data on both McThunel and Smith that corroborates what you see from the Google location information. You can follow the cell towers and see them traveling up the interstate, across to Lake Cormorant, and back to Batesville.

You have additional cell tower location data on Roko Ayodele's phone. It shows the same thing you see with

McThunel's and Smith's phones, and that is traveling from Batesville, up the interstate, across to Lake Cormorant, and back.

We have evidence that all of these defendants are connected to each other. In fact, I think -- at some point during the questioning of some of the witnesses, I think defense counsel admitted these guys are all friends. But you know from the evidence -- we have Facebook evidence connecting Jamarr Smith and Roko Ayodele. We also have the evidence from the Kirk Auto Company records where Mr. McThunel traded in his car, his red Hyundai, three days after this, and he lists on there Roko Ayodele as one of his references, as a friend. So you have the defendants connected to each other.

You have multiple phone calls between the defendants on the day of the robbery -- before the robbery, during the robbery, afterwards. When I say multiple, it's an abnormal amount of phone calls. There are literally dozens of phone calls.

You've got phone calls between Jamarr Smith and Roko Ayodele. You have phone calls between Jamarr Smith and Gilbert McThunel. You have phone calls between Jamarr Smith and Chevella Hines. And we'll get to her later. And you have a few phone calls between McThunel and Ayodele. Only a few because they were riding together in the white SUV. No point in them calling each other.

We have the white SUV that we see in the video, and we've connected that to Roko Ayodele. It's very clear that he had a white SUV that looks identical to the one we see in the video. You have the red Hyundai in the video, and we have that connected to Gilbert McThunel. You have an eyewitness, Forest Coffman, who places Jamarr Smith at the scene of the robbery in the red Hyundai at the time of the robbery.

We have the fact that Gilbert McThunel traded in his red Hyundai three days after this robbery. Three days after. Why trade in the Hyundai? Because that's the vehicle that an eyewitness saw and spoke to someone at the scene of the crime.

They're not thinking they need to trade in the white SUV because they don't realize that we know the white SUV is there. They don't realize we have the security camera video. But they know Forest Coffman spoke to Smith in the red Hyundai. So, naturally, one of the defendants is wanting to get rid of part of the evidence, part of the tools of the crime.

You also have the fact that on that day he spent \$3,000 cash on trading in for his new used car. You also have the fact that Jamarr Smith opened his business Twin's Shift Shop literally a month after this robbery.

If any of you have ever opened up a business before, you know it takes money to open up a new business. You've got to pay rent. You've got to buy equipment. You have bills and expenses coming in long before the money starts coming in.

\$60,000 or 20,000, being a third of the money taken, would be a nice start to opening a new business.

You have Patra Malone, who testified yesterday that she knows Roko Ayodele. If you look at the phone records, we see that there were text messages between Ms. Malone and Mr. Ayodele right about the time of the robbery. And I believe what she said was, if she ever was texting with Mr. Ayodele, the number she knew to be his in her phone, it was him she was texting. She wasn't texting anybody else. She wasn't texting Little Bo. Doesn't even know Little Bo. She's texting Ayodele.

And, finally, you have Chevella Hines. Chevella Hines had some sort of relationship with Jamarr Smith at that time. Chevella Hines is the postmaster at Robinsonville. Chevella Hines knows the postal procedures. She knows what the post office does with the money they collect. She knows how much money they collect. And it's a surprising amount. She knows Sylvester Cobbs's route and when he runs that route. She knows that the money is put in the registered mailbags.

This is information that's not known to the general public and isn't even known to all of the postal employees.

Only the people who need to know, only the people that handle the money or the postmasters are the ones that know the money is in the registered mailbags.

And what did the assailant take when he robbed the

truck? He didn't take the regular mail. He didn't take the wallet from Mr. Cobbs. He took only the registered mailbags because he knew that's where the money was. And you have Chevella Hines tied in with Jamarr Smith and multiple phone calls between them on the day of and particularly right after the robbery.

That is real evidence. It's real evidence. Now, some of that evidence is circumstantial. Some of it is direct evidence. But as you can see from the Court's instructions, direct -- you should not be concerned about whether evidence is direct or circumstantial. Consider and weigh all of the evidence because the law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence.

Ladies and gentlemen, I often say that trying a case is like putting together a jigsaw puzzle. I occasionally work a jigsaw puzzle. If I do, I normally -- when I get started, I separate the edges and the corners, put them over here. Then I look at my picture.

If I've got a picture that has something large and red in it, all of the pieces with red I put in a pile together. If I've got a blue sky, I take all of the pieces with a blue sky and put them together and try to separate them into piles.

Now, I can't take all of the red pieces and put them together and complete the puzzle. That's just a small part of it. But when you take the red pieces and the blue pieces and the edges

and you put them all together, you get the complete picture. Trying a case is the same thing.

For example, the phone records by themselves don't prove the defendant is guilty of a crime. But when you combine the phone records and the Google location information and the cell tower data and the phone calls -- I think I already said phone calls -- the links to the various vehicles, the eyewitness testimony putting Jamarr Smith at the scene, and the other evidence, when you put it all together, you get a clear picture of what happened.

Now, one other thing that Mr. Lewis told you in opening statement the other day is he made the comment that this is the first case in the country to ever be tried with Google location information. I'm not sure if that's true or not. Maybe it is. Maybe it isn't. I agree that in 2018 geofence warrants were kind of a newfangled tool, a new device that police could use to help solve a crime.

Mr. Lewis made a comment, though, that Google location information is not very precise. I take the exact opposite view. I think it's very precise.

We all think about Google Maps. I've got Google Maps on my phone. If I have location services turned on and I'm in a strange place, when I hit Google Maps, in a couple of seconds a little blue dot comes up there and shows me exactly where I am.

If I walk out this courthouse door right now and open up Google Maps, in a couple of seconds it's going to show me I'm at the intersection of Jackson Avenue and -- I believe this is Ninth Street, and it's going to pinpoint exactly where I am. If I'm not familiar with Oxford and I'm trying to figure out where do I want to go eat lunch today, I can look and see exactly where all of the restaurants are around me.

I don't ever use -- rarely ever use these apps that give you directions someplace because, frankly, I'm a dinosaur. I'm one that wants to get out a map and plot my route before I go. But I've traveled before with people that are using these apps, and these apps are so precise. They don't just tell you go down the road and exit on Oak Street. They literally say, in 500 feet, turn right. In one mile, take a left at the light. It is very, very precise.

In fact, in his opening statement, Chiniche told you that he was concerned that you might convict his client because Google location information puts him in the box, puts him inside that geofence box at the post office at the time of the robbery. Of course, he's concerned about it because he knows just how precise this Google location information is.

So I'm going to take a closer look at the evidence for a few minutes, but before I do, I want to digress for a second. I love magic. I've been to two or three big magic shows, and occasionally I see some magic shows on TV, and I like to watch

them.

If you've ever watched a magic show, you'll see that the magician -- he's always trying to get you focused over here (indicating) on what he's doing with his left hand. He wants to distract your attention and get you looking at something over here that's irrelevant. It's not important. But he wants you to focus on this (indicating) so you don't see what he's doing with his right hand.

Defense attorneys in trials are often like magicians, in that they want to get you focused on something that's not important, not relevant, because they don't want you to focus on the evidence. For example, in this case -- in this case, you may hear from defense counsel about the Google geofence, and why didn't it pick up Sylvester Cobbs? And why didn't it pick up Rico Ayodele? Why didn't it pick up Forest Coffman? Why didn't it pick up the occasional car that we see briefly driving through the scene?

There's a number of reasons why it might not. For one, you've heard that, unless you have location services on, it's not going to pick up your location. And, apparently, there's many, many people that don't ever turn on location services.

Or you can see -- from the records in G-4 where we have all of the location information on McThunel and Smith, you can see that while Google is frequently checking your location,

it's not literally marking your location every single second. It's every two or three minutes. So if you're just a car passing through, unless Google is checking location at that precise moment that you pass through the box, it's not going to pick you up.

But, more importantly, that's one of those distractions. They want you focusing and asking questions about why didn't the geofence pick up other people so you're not focused on the important thing, which is the fact that the geofence picked up Gilbert McThunel and Jamarr Smith.

Now, when we got the information -- the first information back -- this is step one of the geofence, and it shows three devices. It shows the device that -- number 479 that only hit at 5:58 p.m. That's almost 30 minutes after the robbery. The devices of real interest is Gilbert McThunel's device, which hit, I believe, seven times between 5:22 and 5:30, and Jamarr Smith's device that hit three times between 5:22 and 5:25.

But that's just the start of the case. That identified potential suspects. Up till that time, the Government couldn't identify who was in that video, but that gives us names to start looking and start now trying to see can we corroborate that, can we prove that those guys actually were involved in the crime. We've got them at the scene. We've got them at the scene for an extended period during the time of the

robbery.

But what else can we do to put that together? We've got phone records. We've got quite a bit of phone records.

All of the phone records are on the wallet drives, but to make it a little easier for you to read in the jury room, we have pulled excerpts, and we've highlighted in the excerpts all of the phone calls between -- between the defendants here and other interested parties.

I'm not going to focus on all of these this morning. I don't have time to go through all of that. But I would just note -- this is from Exhibit G-6A. These are Gilbert McThunel's phone records. And if you look -- and keep in mind, on the C Spire records, they're in straight military time. On the T-Mobile and AT&T records, they're in UTC time; so you first have to subtract six hours and then convert the military time to civilian time.

On Gilbert McThunel's records, we see at 5:16 p.m. -right about the time -- right before this robbery begins, we
have a phone call from Jamarr Smith's number to Gilbert
McThunel's number, and it lasts 350 seconds. And you can see
the tower it's pinging off is the Lake Cormorant tower.

Now, I don't know what was said during that phone call, but I would suggest to you -- you know Jamarr Smith is following the truck to the location. He's calling Gilbert McThunel saying, "Hey, get ready. He's coming. He's on his

way. Are you there? Are you in place?"

And then at 5:30 p.m., you have a call from McThunel and Ayodele that lasts 245 seconds. That's approximately four minutes. I suspect then he was calling Ayodele, the guy that dropped him off in the white SUV saying, "Hey. Hey, man. Where are you? Come get me."

Because you remember from the video, after the robbery occurred and Mr. Cobbs pulls around to the front, the assailant is running around the back not knowing what to do, and his ride's not back. And then there's the train over here. His ride is somewhere across the tracks. Maybe Mr. Ayodele just got too far away or maybe he got slowed down by the train and couldn't get back, but there's a phone call to McThunel and Ayodele probably asking for him to come get him.

Then we have the phone records in evidence as G-5A. The full set is on G-5. I'm going to try to hit these very briefly. These are the T-Mobile records. And not only do they have the specific latitude and longitude of the towers, but they actually have the names of the towers over here on the side.

And if you look at the records, Jamarr Smith travels around noon that day up to the Robinsonville/Tunica area. Then he comes back, and he's in Batesville by about 1:45. And between 2:54 and 3:07 p.m., there's three phone calls between Mr. Smith and Mr. Ayodele. They're still pinging off the tower

in Batesville. I suspect at that time Smith's calling Ayodele saying, "Hey, man. You about ready? Is McThunel with you? Let's go."

Shortly after that, if you look over here in the right column, you can see his phone leaves and goes to Sardis, Hernando, Nesbit, Robinsonville, Lake Cormorant. And for a period of time between 4:17 and 5:49 p.m., Mr. Smith's phone is making multiple calls pinging off the towers in either Tunica -- I'm sorry -- in either Robinsonville or Lake Cormorant with one time when it hits the tower in Tunica, all while making calls with Ayodele and McThunel and Hines. And then you can literally follow his phone back to Batesville afterwards, going from Crenshaw to Senatobia, and arriving back to Batesville at approximately 6:21 p.m.

You heard from Chris Moody, the expert witness who works in the technical services unit of the postal service. He has plotted all of this information on a map for you. And it's really not that complicated. There are programs that if you take this information from Google and from the phone companies and put it in this program, it will plot all of the points on the map.

And what you see -- you see several things. You see, first of all, from the geofence location, Jamarr Smith. It put him at the scene three times between -- I believe it was 5:22 and 5:25. And where's he at? He's right here in front of the

old store right where Forest Coffman saw him. It puts Gilbert McThunel there at the post office seven times. It puts him right there at the post office during the time of the robbery.

And he's put together -- this is just kind of -- it doesn't show the times, but it shows the movement of the phones. I believe the red one is Mr. McThunel, and the yellow one is Mr. Smith, and it shows them traveling up here to Lake Cormorant before the robbery and then back down 3 and cutting across the interstate and back to Batesville. And if you watch the animated videos that are in evidence on the wallet drive on G-25, you can literally watch the phones travel from Batesville, across to Lake Cormorant, and back.

The other thing that Mr. Moody showed you is that all three phones -- all three of them were at the Lake Cormorant post office at the time of the robbery.

Now, I look for you to hear some argument about the cell tower information reliability, the Google reliability. For example, the cell towers -- the phone company rep said the phones are always looking for the strongest signal, and usually that's going to be the closest tower. Now, yes, there are a number of things that the phone looks for to connect, and there are reasons why occasionally it might not hit the closest tower, but usually it's going to find the closest tower.

If we had a case where we had one phone call, one phone call where one time one defendant the tower was at Lake

Cormorant, maybe you might have an argument. Hey, maybe that was the one time when other towers were down and there was a football game going on and the closest available tower was an hour from home. We have dozens, dozens, dozens of phone calls. Do you really believe that on all of those dozens of calls it's just picking out some random tower far away from the phone?

We're not relying on one phone call or one location from Google. It's dozens of phone calls. It's dozens, if not hundreds, of Google location points for both McThunel and Smith, which I believe clearly shows that these phones traveled from Batesville to Lake Cormorant and back.

Now, let's talk about Sylvester Cobbs for a minute. You heard his testimony. He was struck with a weapon multiple times, left a scar on his face. He testified that he was threatened by the assailant. Said that the assailant first said -- threatened to shoot him. Later, when they were struggling, said, "I ought to just kill you."

When Mr. Chiniche was cross-examining Stephen Mathews a couple of days (sic), he suggested that perhaps Sylvester Cobbs was involved in this. You've heard the 911 call. It's in evidence as G-8. I don't have time to play it for you this morning, but I would encourage you to play G-8 again when you're in the jury room. Listen to Mr. Cobbs on that 911 call made shortly after the robbery.

He describes in great detail how the man attacked him

with a gun. Said the gun ended up on the ground. He thought maybe he could get to it, but he couldn't. The assailant got to it, continued to beat him.

You can see in the video -- looks like the assailant is pointing a gun at him. You can't see the gun, but you can see him doing this (indicating) while Cobbs is on the ground. You heard the shakiness of his voice on that 911 call. Does he sound like somebody that was involved in this crime?

You also heard from Forest Coffman. Forest Coffman has nothing to gain from being here. He testified that on the day of the robbery he had been walking back and forth from his uncle's shop behind his trailer right there across the street from the post office. He sees a red car. It's not familiar to him. It's a small rural community. You recognize everybody's car and know everybody's car around there.

He doesn't recognize it, and he's acting funny, and he goes up and approaches the gentleman. He says, "Hey, can I help you? What's going on?" Of course, he doesn't know who that guy is. It's a stranger from Batesville, as it turns out. He doesn't know who he is.

It took a while for the postal service to identify potential suspects. So when they did, they came back to Mr. Coffman 17 months later and showed him three photo lineups and asked him, "Can you identify anybody? You don't have to circle anybody at all, but do you see anybody in these

pictures?" Forest Coffman circled Jamarr Smith.

Now, you may hear from the defendants that was 17 months later. How can you remember something 17 months later? That's -- that's impossible. I would argue just the opposite. If 17 months later you can look at 18 strangers in a photo lineup and pick one specifically and it be the one, I'd say it's very good memory.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Five minutes.

MR. MIMS: Let's talk about jury instructions for just a minute.

Tracy, how am I doing on time? Five-minute warning?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Uh-huh.

MR. MIMS: Thank you.

Let's talk about jury instructions for just a minute.

One of the first instructions I want to look at, where the

Court tells you you are only concerned with the guilt of these
three gentlemen on trial here today. You're not concerned with
the guilt of anybody else not on trial. As my friend Bob

Norman reminded me this morning, we fry one fish at a time or,
in this case, maybe three fish at a time.

You may hear from them about other potential people that may have been involved. And I don't dispute that there may have been other people involved. In fact, if you look at our indictment, in the very first paragraph, we state that Smith, Ayodele, and McThunel conspired with each other and

other persons known and unknown to the grand jury to commit this crime. There may have been others involved, but today we're concerned about whether these three defendants were involved or not. Are they guilty or not?

Another instruction I want to look at -- it's always one of my favorite instructions. It says, "In considering the evidence, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience." In other words, use reason and common sense.

Let's think about that for a minute. One of the arguments you're going to hear from the defendants is, hey, the devices may have been in Lake Cormorant, but that doesn't mean the defendants were in Lake Cormorant. That defies all logic. Everybody in this room has a cell phone. Some people may have more than one cell phone. We always keep our cell phones with us all of the time.

When I leave the house in the morning, my phone is with me until I get back to the house that night. And when I walk in the door, usually I sit my phone down on the desk by the back door where I come in. And so I may be down the hall and not near my phone, but the phone is at home with me. It's not off somewhere else.

And, yes, every once in a blue moon, I've left in the morning and left my phone sitting on the desk and had to go

back and get it, or I've left work at lunch and realize when I get home, oh, I left my phone at the office. But my phone doesn't go out and get in somebody else's car and drive off an hour from home. Really, my phone doesn't get out -- doesn't walk out and get in my own car and go an hour from home and I'm not there. That defies common sense.

And if you think about the argument the defendants are making in this case, that somehow they lost their phone or left their phone in their car, it's almost impossible to believe that that would happen for one person, but in this case, if you follow that, they're saying that all three people -- three of them all left their phones -- lost their phones on the same day; that their phones just grew legs and walked out and hopped in their own cars and drove off an hour away with three completely different people, three people who knew each other and were calling each other constantly during the time of the crime, three people who apparently had a connection maybe to Chevella Hines to know how to pull this off. It just defies common sense that that would happen.

Also, a couple of other things just on the topic of common sense. We've already talked about the fact that phones generally connect to the closest tower. You can -- we know that -- that's the case. You've heard the testimony from the phone reps. We know that to be true. You can literally watch the towers and see where people travel.

data is even more accurate.

And the tower information is confirmed by Google location information, which is completely separate. You even heard from -- I believe Mr. Lewis acknowledged this, and the expert, Chris Moody, said the same thing. The Google location

I want to touch briefly on the -- on the charges and the elements to prove them. We have two counts in the indictment. We have a substantive count, and we have the conspiracy count. The substantive count is Number 2, and that's just the one -- that's just the one that says these defendants committed this robbery. Keep in mind that you don't have to be the person holding the gun to commit the crime. If you assist, that's called aiding and abetting, and you're also just as guilty of the crime.

The Government would have to prove the defendants took money belonging to the United States that was in Cobbs's lawful custody; the defendants took the property by means of force and violence or intimidation; and the defendants put his life in danger -- Cobbs's life in danger by the use of a dangerous weapon. I believe the Government has proven all of that.

Again, I would just encourage you to remember that whether it's aiding and abetting or conspiracy -- by the way, on conspiracy, one of the things the Government has to prove is one of the substantive counts. These are listed as A, B, and C at the bottom of Count 1. We don't have to prove each and

every one of those. If we prove any one of those substantive counts, you can convict on the conspiracy, but I would assert to you we've proven all three beyond a reasonable doubt.

The important thing about aiding and abetting in a conspiracy, again, is you don't have to hold the gun to be guilty. If you drive the drop-off or getaway car or if you drive the lookout car, you're guilty. You're just as guilty as the man who beat Sylvester Cobbs with the gun.

Ladies and gentlemen, I've taken up enough of your time this morning. I would just ask you to -- when you return to the jury room, don't get in a rush. This is an important case, and there's a lot of evidence to go through. I would encourage you to watch the video, listen to the 911 calls, look over the animated maps in G-25 from Chris Moody, look over the phone records with voluminous phone calls back and forth between the defendants at the time of the robbery and also showing the location of the cell towers, and return a verdict of guilty on both counts for each defendant.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mims.

Mr. Chiniche.

MR. CHINICHE: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. MIMS: Your Honor, if I may for just one second. I've got some exhibits. I need to put them back up here in case they need them, and I'm a little disorganized.

THE COURT: Okay. 1 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. MIMS: 2 THE COURT: Thank you. 3 MR. CHINICHE: May I begin? 4 THE COURT: You may. 5 MR. CHINICHE: May it please the Court. Opposing 6 counsel. 7 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I disagree with Mr. Mims's puzzle analogy, put the pieces together and it gives you a full picture. I like to say they take a square peg and 10 hammered it into a circle. 11 I recently had a bad experience with Google Map, such 12 though that when my daughter wanted to drive to Memphis, I 13 didn't want her to use Google Map because I -- I had a bad 14 experience with it on the way to the beach. 15 16 This case against Mr. McThunel is based on pure speculation. There's no witness that identified Mr. McThunel 17 as the assailant. There's no prosecution witness that 18 identified Mr. McThunel in this courtroom. The video doesn't 19

as the assailant. There's no prosecution witness that identified Mr. McThunel in this courtroom. The video doesn't show Mr. McThunel, Mr. Smith, or Mr. Ayodele. There's no car tag to identify that -- this sedan the Government says was Mr. McThunel's, there's no car tag to identify it to Mr. McThunel.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Forest Coffman, the white gentleman from the Delta that lived at that intersection, he was interviewed on the day

of the robbery. He gave a lot of information about a driver, but he only told law enforcement it was a red car. He couldn't identify the tag. He couldn't identify if that car was from Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, or somewhere else.

There's also no motive for Mr. McThunel to commit this crime. No motive. I'll talk about that in a minute. There's no physical evidence or direct evidence linking Mr. McThunel to this crime.

You heard information about other suspects where Investigator Mathews either didn't follow up or didn't -- didn't result in a case. Edwin T. Brown. We heard about him. We didn't see him, but we heard about him. Edwin T. Brown was so important to law enforcement they got his phone records, and they learned that he cancelled his cell phone on the day of this crime.

Remember Edwin T. Brown? He's the one that had a serious felon -- serious criminal record. He's a convicted felon with an armed robbery charge of a grocery store, meaning he went into a grocery store with a firearm.

We have Chevella Hines. We heard about her. We didn't see her. She also cancelled her cell phone on the day of the crime. Government's Exhibit Number 9 shows you that. Got G-9C. This is the -- this is the phone that belongs to Chevella Hines. It's her phone number that was in some of the records. Mobile deactivation date, 2/5/2018, the day of this

crime. When was it terminated? 2/5/2018.

Chevella Hines was the postmaster at the Robinsonville post office. She's also the supervisor of the Lake Cormorant post office that -- Inspector Mathews told us that, so did Mr. Cobbs, the -- the driver. Chevella Hines knew the route, the time, and she's the one that knows about this registered mail.

You also heard the name -- I asked Inspector Mathews about the employee Latorian Clark. I asked Mr. Mathews why he showed up in a law enforcement report because he's a gentleman that Chevella Hines let off that day, postal employee allowed to leave that day. No follow-up investigation. No information on him. But it was important enough to be in a law enforcement report.

Travonya Nash was a C Spire account holder. They subpoenaed C Spire records on 662-710-7511. The account holder was Travonya Nash. The C Spire employee that testified said that was not a prepaid account. That was an account -- an arrears account where you had to produce a photo ID, social security number, credit check.

Then Mr. Cobbs described a suspicious interaction he had with somebody in Robinsonville earlier that day. Somebody he thought was suspicious walked up to him -- it's before he's robbed -- asked him about how you apply for a job. I asked Inspector Mathews about that. Did you locate that gentleman?

He was in a tan two-toned vehicle. No information there.

Forest Coffman, the white gentleman that lived in the Delta at that intersection, when he was interviewed that day, he told DeSoto County Sheriff's Department he had a video, and they took that video. We didn't see it. I'd like to know what was on that video.

We have -- in the geofence, we have this -- three devices -- three accounts that were returned, one of which was ruled out by law enforcement.

Ladies and gentlemen, the timeline you heard -February 5th, 2018, was the date of the incident. That day
Mr. Cobbs was interviewed, and Mr. Coffman was interviewed,
Forest Coffman. That's the day that Mr. Coffman identified a
red vehicle. We go a year later, February 2019. Inspector
Mathews said no leads. Haven't solved the crime yet.

And then in May 2019, they learned about a new technique to law enforcement, something law enforcement was getting into. Let's send a subpoena, a search warrant to Google. Let's use their data. Let's draw a box around the crime scene, and let's get a warrant to see what kind of information they'll give us. Google calls that a geofence.

And remember it came back with three accounts, three results, I'll call it, two of which the Government said were Mr. Smith -- one was Mr. Smith, one was Mr. McThunel, and there was a third one they ruled out. They have to do further

investigations because all it does is give you the e-mail address. But that's where we had that permanentwavesrecords account that was not investigated.

So they keep digging. They've got a square peg.

They've got to get it in this round hole. And in June and

July 2019 -- what is that? 15 months later -- they get cell

tower/cell phone information, and they start naming McThunel,

Smith, and Ayodele.

So then federal -- the investigators go back to Mr. Coffman. Remember, this time he's living in Memphis, and they meet in some building in Memphis. This is in July 2019. Mr. Coffman sits down with an investigator who's working on the suspects, shows him a lineup -- three different lineups.

Two of those lineups Coffman doesn't pick out either of the defendants. Nobody. But it picked out one. This is 15 months later. He picked out a guy that he had a 30-second interaction with. And he described Mr. Smith as having a red goatee while he's in an apartment -- in a Memphis building with an investigator. Mr. Smith doesn't have a red goatee.

And when Mr. Coffman was asked can you be 100 percent sure about picking that gentleman out of the lineup, he said, "I wouldn't say I was 100 percent sure. I was confident, but I wasn't 100 percent." And that would mean -- if that story is true, that would mean that Mr. Smith had to be driving the red car, who they say was my client's car.

9 10 11

8

13 14

15

16

12

17

19

20

18

21 22

23

24

25

So we've got this new technology. We've got a geofence drawn with Google's data, obtained with Google's information, and it produces three results, two of which the Government says are relevant. We'll talk about how reliable that is later. You heard it during the trial. But there are other people in that geofence that weren't returned on the Google search warrant.

Mr. Coffman -- Forest Coffman, who lived next door, he and his girlfriend -- I asked him, "Did you have an Android phone?" He did. You're probably wondering why. But that's Because if he had an Android phone, it should have shown up in the geofence. I asked him if he had a Gmail account. did. He didn't show up in the geofence. I asked him if he had a girlfriend.

I asked Mr. Cobbs, the victim, "Did you have a cell phone?" We know he did. He called 91 -- he called his wife, and then he called 911. "Did you have a Gmail account?" He did. He didn't show up.

Look at -- if you feel like you need to, look at that video entirely. It's 33 minutes' long. Those are two individuals with Google accounts not showing up in the geofence. How reliable is that? We'll discuss that later.

We had Mr. Moody testify through Zoom. Remember him? He's the Government's witness who testified about the geolocation, historical information. He didn't like us, and he

didn't like Mr. Lewis's questions. But even he had to admit that Google strives for its historical location data to be 68 percent accurate.

Look at that video. You will see that -- you already know that Mr. Cobbs, the victim, Mr. Coffman were in that geofence, but there were other vehicles and other people in that geofence as well. It's a 33-minute video.

I'll submit to you that at the 4:10 mark, there's a dark SUV; at the 5:48 mark, there's a white SUV; at the 6:20 mark, there's a dark sedan. Not the red one. I'd submit at 9:40 -- that's when the mail truck shows up. At 10:30, that's when the red sedan shows up. At 10:20, we have another dark sedan. I submit that that looks like a Nissan Altima to me.

At 12:40, we have a white or a silver-colored sedan. At the 14:35 mark, we have a train that comes through. At the 23:22 mark, there's a red pickup truck. You'll notice that red pickup truck because Mr. Cobbs backs his mail truck again back to the back of the video -- back of the post office.

24:25, we see a newer white SUV coming over the railroad tracks heading southbound, and then at 25:20, we see a dark crossover, I'll call it, because I can't tell if it's an SUV or a sedan -- a dark crossover pulls into the parking lot of the post office. And then, lastly, right before it ends, 31:40, there's a white pickup truck that passes by. That's about 10 or 11 vehicles in addition to the two the Government's

focused on.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is -- maybe you've heard of something called the power of suggestion. Power of suggestion is a psychological process where an individual is given an idea, and that idea then becomes that person's reality. The more that these investigators and these prosecutors look at that video, the more they want it to be a 2013 Hyundai Sonata. The more you look at it, the more you want it to fit.

Prosecution says the only reason McThunel sold that car was to get rid of it. Why can't there be other explanations? Why can't it be maybe there was a nationwide recall on the 2013 Hyundai Sonata engine? Why can't it be --excuse me, Your Honor. Why can't it be because it had 133,000 miles on it? Why can't it be maybe it wasn't running right? Why can't it be maybe it had too many recent repairs? Why can't it be maybe he didn't want to drive it anymore? Why does he have to be a criminal? And why does the \$3,000 he put down have to come from a robbery? What if he had just won something at the casino with his buddies in Robinsonville? Mr. McThunel got a loan for the trade-in for the car?

I went over this with the witness. He's got college experience. He's -- he listed his job. He listed how much money he makes monthly. He pays \$300 of rent living with relatives. He's got a bank account at BancorpSouth. He had

auto insurance with Allstate. He had a credit score. And he listed his pay stub. He's got no motive to commit a crime.

We have Government Exhibit 19. I want to show you this, and I don't want you to be confused. This is the red Hyundai. This is a snapshot from the video you'll notice from the green lines. This right here where my pen is (indicating), that's a stock photo. That's not Mr. McThunel's car.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you have questions that are unanswered about this case, that's called reasonable doubt.

It's the prosecutor's job to answer those questions for you.

The judge read to you an instruction that I want to highlight. And it says, "If, after examining all of the testimony and evidence in this case, you have reasonable doubt as to the identity of the defendants as the perpetrators of the offense charged, you must find the defendants not guilty."

That's what I'm asking you to do. Mr. McThunel is not guilty.

First day we were here we had the whole venire out there. I explained the three types of burden of proof. Two are in a civil case. One is in this case. Civil case, by a preponderance of the evidence, more likely true than not true. Not here. Another kind of civil case, fraud, clear and convincing. That's not even here. But beyond a reasonable doubt? I submit to you no.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. You still comfortable?

Mr. Lewis. 1 I'm going to let --MR. LEWIS: 2 I think I'm going to go before, Your MR. TRAVIS: 3 Honor. 4 THE COURT: Excuse me. Thank you. 5 MR. TRAVIS: Thank you, Judge. 6 Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court. 7 **THE COURT:** Yes, you may proceed. 8 MR. TRAVIS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. **JURORS:** Good morning. 10 MR. TRAVIS: As you know, I represent Mr. Ayodele. 11 Stand up again, please, sir. 12 (DEFENDANT COMPLIES.) 13 MR. TRAVIS: Thank you very much. 14 I'll start at the back end of the presumption of 15 16 innocence. You're going to hear it when I finish my remarks. Y'all all heard that in voir dire and what the Court has said. 17 But as he stood there, he's presumed innocent. And every 18 person on that wall, all of you, this judge, these reporters, 19 20 these lawyers, young and older, these people in the audience -they all have the presumption of innocence. Put a lot of 21 weight on that because you've got a lot of weight to lift when 22 you get back there in that room. It's a heavy barbell, the 23 presumption of innocence. 24 When the prosecutors -- who are also presumed 25

innocent. This fine agent is. These fine prosecutors. This lovely lady. But they want to say, based on circumstances and speculation in regards to Mr. Ayodele -- when I'm talking to you, I'm just talking about Mr. Ayodele. Okay? -- and they want to say that that's enough to convict him on this two-count indictment.

And I'm saying to you, ladies and gentlemen, that, as I said to you earlier in the week, I'm asking you for a verdict on behalf of Mr. Ayodele of not guilty. Not guilty. Not guilty. I'm saying to you that the prosecutors have not proven their circumstantial case to show you -- with the evidence that you've heard on Mr. Ayodele, they have not been able to show you proof, evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay? They haven't shown that. Circumstances are not enough with Mr. Ayodele. Not on this case.

I asked you when we picked you for this jury -- the judge first said we wanted to trust you. We trust you. You're on this jury. All of the lawyers, prosecutors, defense lawyers, we chose you. We trust you.

During my questioning on the voir dire when we were trying to decide who to put on the jury, we trusted you, and we chose you. And I asked you then -- you can recall -- at the end of this, at the end of the day, to trust yourself. I don't know if you recall, but I ask you all, all 12 of you now, to trust yourself. And I think I said to stand on your own two

feet, if you recall.

Mr. Mims, the prosecution, has this circumstantial case, but as a mutual friend of ours, Honorable Bob Norman with the U.S. Attorney's Office -- Mr. Mims noted what Mr. Norman said. He's also said, "As you know, you never know," quote/unquote. Honorable Bob Norman. "As you know, you never know."

And if, at the end of this case, you just don't know beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Ayodele is in any fray here with anybody, then that is reasonable doubt, and you can honorably and -- walk as tall as any man or lady ever walked through those doors out and say, "It was a heavy lift, a lot of circumstances, but I vote not guilty for Mr. Ayodele," my client, whether he's friends with anybody.

We do know from the evidence from former Agent Mathews, who testified truthfully -- on the stand, he played no games, but he's not able to give you enough on this case to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that my client is guilty of any wrongdoing whatsoever. When I say that, I'm not saying that he lied. It's not his fault that he doesn't have that. He did his job.

He's been honest on everything, including this business about Mr. Ayodele's phone. Let's call it the 4000, if you'll stay with me on all of that. That's never been burned. Never destroyed the phone. And also that he had another

telephone, the 228 number -- find it in a minute. You're all aware that he testified that there were -- he had a second telephone. And I think Mr. Mims has told you that some people, many people, have more than one phone. I don't want one phone, but a lot of people have more than one phone.

The testimony of Mr. Mathews, again, no phones were ever cancelled. It's been proven into evidence that Mr. Ayodele has another phone number. At a minimum, it was 228-223-7879. Do you recall seeing that in the exhibits? That phone does not show up on all of the videos, photographs, all of the technology that is about to rob our souls that shows these colored photographs so we can all watch television again and let our brain go dead -- showing that -- they want to say Ayodele and other named persons in here. That's a device, as Mr. Goodloe so well pointed out, in this case. That is not proof beyond a reasonable doubt that that is Mr. Ayodele. Okay?

I asked Mr. Mathews this, if I can read my own writing, about the white SUV. "Your evidence on the date of the crime of February 5th, 2018, does not, by video or any other form of identification, show Mr. Ayodele physically in a white SUV at the Lake Cormorant post office where Mr. Cobbs was assaulted?" He said, "No." That's Mr. Chiniche.

There's no video or photo showing him in a white SUV, whether it be his or anybody else's. Male or female in the

car -- we don't know -- in the truck? We don't know. We don't know. This agent didn't know and still does not know. These prosecutors do not know. That's not their fault. I'm not beating up on them. But they don't know. Several phones.

Let's talk about -- Mr. Mathews spoke to my client on two occasions. Mr. Ayodele was asked to talk to them, and he voluntarily did that on two occasions. He didn't have to do that. I hope y'all realize that.

But on October the 20th of 2019, the first time, he met with them, and that's when the information that he had multiple phones -- okay. Friends, fair enough. We all have friends. I'm sure all of you have friends. On that occasion, they asked him whether he was involved in any wrongdoing on February the 5th of 2018 at Lake Cormorant, and he denied that he had. That was his honest answer.

The December 19th meeting, which is all some months after the event of February 5th of 2018, again, he denied any involvement in any wrongdoing. He answered them.

On both occasions, he mentioned, as the prosecutor brought up, Little Bo. Two times in the October 2019, if I got that right, and December, Little Bo -- he told him that he sometimes loans his white SUV to Little Bo. I hope I made the point on cross from that stand that we all loan our vehicles from time to time.

It's not beyond comprehension, possibilities, that if

someone has more than one phone and they loan their vehicles to Little Bo from time to time -- we don't know if Little Bo should be sitting at that table. I don't know. They don't know. They don't know. But Little Bo has gone to that land from which no man ever returns -- I believe it was in May of 2019 he passed away, with all due respect. We don't know anything about him, other than this agent -- this fine agent, former agent -- he didn't -- Little Bo is not made up. That was a person. That was a person.

Again, nobody here at my table with Mr. Ayodele has gotten rid of any phones or any vehicles, and he talked to these people two times. Two times. They asked him to talk, and he's talked to them two times.

I'm with Mr. Chiniche on the puzzle part because I know this is going to be work and a lot of heavy lifting, but I don't think, with the information that has come out on my client, talking about my client, that the puzzle fits perfectly for these prosecutors.

Again, Mr. Mims, some people have more than one phone. It defies common sense. It doesn't defy common sense. I'm asking you to use your common sense. Please use all of your life experiences when -- from the time you were able as a young person going through your teenage years, your younger years, when under whatever random circumstances it looked to you like you may had done something wrong, wrong place, wrong time.

Look at your friends. Look at your future and somebody -- whether it's your daddy or your mama or the principal who's pointing their finger at you, you, you, or you and saying you did it, but you didn't do it. And if you've worked with a lot of people in your civilian careers, military careers, you know things like that happen. That is common sense. Common sense does not exclude it. It pulls it in. Use it all.

The judge asked you to keep an open mind. And I am asking you on my client there to keep an open mind on these facts. Several phones. A phone. Again, they want you to watch these numbers and attach a device to a flesh and blood human being. That's not enough.

With Mr. Ayodele, you know, there's no, that I heard of, influx of moneys or high-end purchases. Nothing. That's not his fault. That's not the agent's fault. I'm just saying I don't hear that. That would tell me something. Large amount of money, well, I -- again, nothing to show that my client is out there with moneys playing around.

My heart goes out to Mr. Cobbs, but, again, nothing ever showed -- and nobody -- by anything other than this phone number -- although I respect the technology. I've learned a lot about it on this case. Trust me. I'm of that generation where I didn't grow up with it like a lot of people do.

But I've -- many legal scholars will argue that

circumstantial evidence should never be sufficient to convict someone, but I don't know that I'm on that page. But when you've got openings in the proof like on Mr. Ayodele with multiple phones, no phones have been disposed of, no vehicles have been disposed of, not picked out from anybody on the scene, not on the video, that's when it comes in and weighs on you that this judge gave you it has to be proof beyond a reasonable doubt, that there is that presumption of innocence.

The prosecutors on a circumstantial case, to some degree, are shooting dice. Because with all due respect, they just don't know. That's not their fault. They're shooting dice. And they're wanting you -- there's been no lies here. None. They want -- they think it or they wouldn't be here. They don't want an innocent person to get in trouble. But they think it. They've got blinders on. They're professional prosecutors. That's their job.

You are now the judge. You are now the decider. I would say to you, don't play the percentages or the probabilities the way the prosecutors are having to do on this case or we wouldn't be in this courtroom. He maintains his innocence, Mr. Ayodele, or we would not be here. But don't shoot dice on anybody's liberty here. That's what is at stake. When it comes to liberty, err on the side of liberty.

On this one, maybe it's for God to know and man to wonder, but don't let anyone take anything away from you.

```
There's a great poem, a quote by Rudyard Kipling. "If you can
 1
    keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming
 2
    it on you, but if you can trust yourself when all men doubt
 3
    you."
 4
             I go back to that word "trust" that the judge brought
 5
    up, that I brought up. Trust yourself when you go back there.
 6
    Please trust yourself. Stand your ground. Be stronger than
 7
    you've ever been. It's an important day. You're involved
 8
    here, and you are the final judge. And I'm respectfully asking
 9
    you to return a verdict of not guilty on Counts 1 and 2 --
10
             Stand up one more time, young man. Mr. Ayodele --
11
    thank you, sir --
12
         (DEFENDANT COMPLIES.)
13
             MR. TRAVIS: -- who has that armor of that presumption
14
    of innocence. And there are reasons on this case where you can
15
16
    render a verdict of not guilty on this case.
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you, Mr. Travis.
17
             MR. LEWIS:
                         May we approach, Your Honor?
18
             THE COURT:
19
                         You may.
20
        (BENCH CONFERENCE OUT OF HEARING OF THE JURY.)
             THE LEWIS: Can we have a short break?
21
             THE COURT:
                         Yes.
22
             MR. LEWIS: Five minutes.
23
             THE COURT:
                         Okay. We're good.
24
        (END OF BENCH CONFERENCE.)
25
```

```
THE COURT:
                          Ladies and gentlemen, it may be a good
 1
    time to take a short break. So I'm going to let you take a
 2
    break for about 15 minutes. Do not discuss this case.
 3
    be back in in 15 minutes.
 4
        (JURY OUT.)
 5
             THE COURT:
                         We'll be in recess for 15 minutes.
 6
        (RECESS TAKEN.)
 7
        (JURY IN.)
 8
             THE COURT:
                         You may have a seat.
             Mr. Lewis.
10
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
             MR. LEWIS:
11
             So, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to go ahead and
12
    tell y'all I am scared to death right now. I am scared that I
13
    have not made the right arguments, I've not asked the right
14
    questions, I've not done what I need to do, and this is my last
15
    chance to be heard in this case. So I'm going to do the best I
16
    can.
17
             Remember -- and y'all have heard it plenty up to this
18
    point -- the Government has got to prove their case beyond a
19
20
    reasonable doubt and must prove every element of their case.
    So when they're talking about the puzzle, you've got to filter
21
    every piece of the puzzle through this reasonable doubt
22
    calculation.
23
             And as I told you in opening, the proof is going to
24
    show that what the prosecutors have been told and what they
25
```

have told you is not the whole story. The whole story is a lot more contradictory and confusing than they think it is. And I told you that they were not going to bring real evidence, real evidence that these guys committed this crime. And when they make the point of defining circumstantial evidence here before you today, you know that they have got problems with lack of direct evidence of the crime.

So let's talk about Mr. Coffman for a minute. He is assuredly a nice person. He wants to help the Government. He is understandably upset that a crime has been committed in his town. He did not identify Jamarr on the date of the incident. He did not. There's just no question about it. He identified somebody completely different. He identified somebody that had a reddish goatee and had light skin.

Now, Mr. Coffman is familiar with African Americans who have reddish hair. He knows that they tend to be very light-skinned people. He did not mess that up. He identified the person that is light-skinned with reddish hair, and that is not Jamarr. There's no way. Okay?

He also identified somebody who's sitting in the car with a hat and a hoodie that's six feet tall, 170 to 180 pounds. It seems entirely unlikely that he can make that kind of determination under the circumstances, but let's assume he did. That is not Jamarr. Okay?

So what happened? Well, we don't know. We do know

that the Government was sure enough after Jamarr in June -- or around June of 2019 when the Google stuff came back. Inspector Martin, who is part of the investigation, he put the lineup sheets together, I guess.

The Government knew at that point, when these lineup sheets were put together, that -- that Coffman identified somebody with light skin and a reddish goatee. And I don't know a lot about their procedures. I'm not sure Inspector Martin did either, but wouldn't it make sense for them to put somebody in that lineup that had reddish hair and light skin?

So y'all can look at Exhibit G-21 when you get back there. You're not going to see anybody in here with reddish hair and light skin. So if they had done that, would Mr. Coffman had picked that person? Something to think about.

But there's no doubt that Coffman identified somebody other than Jamarr on the date of the incident. There's no question about it. And then he supposedly identified Jamarr a year and a half later. And he's been living all of his life not thinking about this for that period of time, and he said he was not 100 percent sure, and that just doesn't add up.

And don't get me started on this in court identification. Okay? You saw Mr. Coffman kind of chuckling about it, and I guess I would have too if it didn't bother me so much. But he had been shown a picture of the person that he identified in the lineup four years ago, and then, God bless

him, he was asked to identify that person again in court. He knew he was looking -- he knew who he was looking for. And, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot put a lot of -- a lot of weight in that.

So let's look at the -- the jury instruction on identification. And Mr. Chiniche showed you this, and I'm going to try not to repeat a lot of things that have already been done, but I do need to show you this. It says down here what -- and this is what -- this is the law. Okay? This is what the Court has told you you must do.

"You may also consider the circumstances surrounding the identification itself, including, for example, the manner in which the defendants were presented to the witness for identification and the length of time that elapsed between the incident in question and the next opportunity the witness had to observe the defendants." All of those factors are here, and all of those -- I went over all of that just now.

And here's the -- here's some really strong language. This is strong coming up right now. If, after examining all of the testimony and evidence in this case, you have a reasonable doubt as to the identity of the defendants as the perpetrators of the offense charged, you must, must find the defendants not guilty. That's pretty strong right there. Okay? That's the law. Why is that language so strong? Because of what I said earlier, reasonable doubt. Okay?

All right. Let's talk about technology and Mr. Moody. And I was the one who cross-examined him; so I'm the one here today who is going to talk about this a little bit here with y'all on closing. But I'm going to -- I'm not going to get into the weeds because I really don't have time, but as y'all know, he was testifying about two separate things. Okay?

He was talking about what he calls historical cell site data. Okay. That's commonly called pinging off of towers, phones connecting with towers. You remember that. And then he talked about Google location services.

So I think if we've heard anything through this trial, we have heard that that stuff is not precise. In fact, Google and these phone companies do not collect that information, do not have that information for the purpose of solving crimes; right?

It's designed to -- as far as the cell phone companies are concerned, it's designed to bill people, figure out if they're making calls. It's so the phone companies can make money. And in the case of Google, it's designed to sell ads. It's designed to help people use their apps. It is by definition not designed to support criminal prosecutions.

And, of course, the Government is going to tell you this stuff is good as gold because they have a vested interest in it being reliable. What else would they say; right? They're prosecuting people with it.

But I think you heard from Mr. Moody that none of this stuff is generally accepted in the scientific community in this country. Nobody other than law enforcement is using this to, you know, prosecute people. Okay? There are no studies about it. It's not -- you know, there are not scientists at universities who study this stuff. The data is not verified. It's not tested. And it's nowhere near as clean and clear and cut and dry as the Government wants you to think.

Now, historical cell site data -- that's the pinging off the towers -- is not -- and the Government admits this -- is not a precise indicator of where anybody is at any given time. The Government showed you these wedges. Here's one I was writing on with Mr. Moody. This is G-25.

They are not saying that anybody was within this colored wedge here. They are saying that if you draw the lines from a point all the way out -- not into infinity but a long way -- if you drew them all the way out, more than likely, somebody was somewhere in that area. Okay? That does not put anybody at the post office. It's just not that precise. It's not designed to do that. That's not why cell companies keep this information.

And the other significance is these towers don't indicate that somebody is close to them at all. The significance is the device -- that the device could be near some other tower somewhere else that's overloaded, that's down

because of maintenance, that's down because of weather, that's obscured because of cars and buildings, topography, other towers, a myriad of factors.

And the point is Mr. Moody did not check one single thing to say that none of that was present. All right? He just relied on what the phone company told him. Well, the phone company is not telling him this, is not providing this information to prosecute these guys.

He could have. He could have verified all of that stuff. He could have done a lot of work on this thing, but he didn't. So don't you think in a case like this where people's liberty is at stake the Government could do a little more work on something like this?

Another thing -- and I didn't think this was a huge point, but I pointed out to Mr. Moody -- this is still G-25 -- that, for example, in his -- in his map, he says up here Cell Site Data from T-Mobile, Jamarr Smith. I said, "Mr. Moody, that's misleading." And he gave a really strange answer. "Okay." Which I intend -- I interpreted to be yes. This is not saying Jamarr Smith is at these locations, as this indicates. It's saying a device is at these locations. Okay? Weak. Weak. It's weak evidence.

All right. Let's talk about Google very quickly. This is very new stuff. Moody had never testified before. He didn't know anybody who's testified about it before to a jury.

There are a lot of people with eyes on this case. Nobody in the scientific community has studied it or validated it. Moody said there can be false positives. The device shows up in the fence when, in fact, it is not, way more than there are false negatives.

But we do know -- and here's the point. We're not misdirecting anybody by pointing this out. We're pointing out -- we're pointing what I'm about to tell you out because it shows that this technology is not reliable. It's not accurate because we know that there were tons of people inside the fence whose device did not show up on -- in this Google data.

Mr. Cobbs, Mr. Coffman, Mr. Coffman's girlfriend, conductors of the train, occupants of the numerous vehicles that were driving around. You can watch the vehicle and see all of this. Okay?

We're not misdirecting you. We're pointing out that it just doesn't add up. It doesn't make sense. Something's not right. That data is not reliable. Why did it not show that?

So let's look at the instruction about expert witnesses. "Merely because such a witness has expressed an opinion does not mean, however, that you must accept this opinion. You should judge such testimony like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness's education and experience, the soundness of the reasons given

for the opinion, and all other evidence in this case." You do not have to accept Mr. Moody's opinions in this matter. And I told you why you should not.

People talking to each other is not enough evidence. I find it odd that the Government thinks that Mr. McThunel and -- I think it's Mr. Ayodele made a four-minute call in the middle of this robbery. Does that sound reasonable after what you saw in the video? Does that make any sense? People talk to each other a lot. Friends talk to each other a lot. A four-minute call in the middle of this whole thing?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Five minutes.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

I'm just going to throw out some things, and then I'm going to close. The Government thought shutting down your phone on February 5 was important. They say Chevella Hines shut down her phone on February 5. She's not over there.

Mr. Brown shut down his phone on February 5. He's not over there. They thought that was important. They clearly think Ms. Hines is involved in this thing.

Okay. Jamarr works. He rebuilds transmissions. He works with his hands. He goes to DeSoto County to get his transmissions. You can look in Exhibit G-24, and he talks about it. This is on February 20. "I'm headed to pick one up from Horn Lake. I'll hit you when I get back."

Oh, and, by the way, he was clearly in business before

this incident. It's in G-24. On January 10 of 2018, "What's up, Little Twin? I have an '05 Kia Sorento. Do you work on Kia? It ran hot twice. I was just going to get another motor, but can you put one in? How much you charge?" "I got you." So the -- the idea that he opened up his business after this incident is just not accurate.

There's a salvage yard in Walls. You can see from the Government's map here Walls -- here's Lake Cormorant (indicating). There's Walls (indicating). There are cell phone hits in Walls.

So think about this. The presumption of innocence protects us all. It protects Jamarr, obviously, but also consider this. It protects the prosecutors from getting wrongful convictions. It protects me, because if he's convicted and I go home, I will go home with guilt and nightmares that I didn't do a good enough job to avoid that. All of the defense lawyers will.

But it protects you too. The presumption of innocence and the burden of proof protects you too because it keeps you from going home tonight and staring at the ceiling and wondering have we convicted an innocent man today. Right?

The evidence must be so clear that you will never worry that you've convicted an innocent person. Your not guilty vote is your power. Any one of you can decide not to convict. Each one of you individually has the power. Do not

give up your honest convictions.

Jamarr works with his hands. I'm going to tell you another story about hands. There's an old wise man, and there's a young smart-aleck boy. And the young boy goes to the wise man all of the time and the wise man -- and asks him questions, and the wise man always has the right answer, and it bothers the young boy.

So he says, I've got an idea. I'm going to go out in the woods, and I'm going to find a bird. I'm going to put it in my hands. I'm going to go to the wise man, and I'm going to say, "Is the bird in my hands alive or is it dead?" And if the old man says the bird is dead, I'm going to open my hands, and the bird is going to fly away. But if he says the bird is alive, I'm going to crush the bird and open my hands and say, "No, you're wrong. The bird is dead." And I'm going -- I'm going to get him.

So he did that. He went out in the woods, and he got a bird, and he came to the old man. He said, "Old Man, I have a bird in my hands. Is it alive or is it dead?" And the old man said, "The bird is in your hands." I'm going to leave Jamarr in your hands.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. McGee.

MR. McGEE: May it please the Court.

They almost got away with it, didn't they? It was close. They almost did. What they didn't realize is there was a camera pointed at them. There was a camera pointed at them. It picked up two of three of the vehicles.

They didn't leave a glove on the scene. Mr. McThunel didn't leave his mask on the scene. He didn't leave his DNA on the scene. He didn't leave a footprint on the scene. But you know what they forgot about? They forgot about these (indicating). Jamarr Smith. Gilbert McThunel. Thomas Ayodele.

What do these do? We've learned this. What do these do? Y'all probably already knew it. They keep track of us. They follow every move. It's almost like dropping -- it's almost like they dropped a map. They dropped a map that this agent right here -- Alabama and Mississippi agents used cutting-edge technology, cutting-edge technology -- we're in 2018 here -- they used cutting-edge technology to bring you all of this evidence I'm about to show you that you've already seen. I submit to you that's impressive.

Let's talk about what -- what the -- what the defendant said in their -- in their closing arguments.

Hopefully, my clicker will work or I might have to get you to assist. I did try it before. I apologize.

And I'll start. Just like Mr. Smith (sic) just said -- let's start with Mr. McThunel. A cancelled cell

phone -- a cancelled cell phone is important. That's what they -- that's what Mr. McThunel's attorney said. It's important. But selling your car three days after the robbery is not important.

Subscriber information, now, that's important.

Travonya Nash, that's important, that's important. But Google subscriber information, not important. And the number given to buy his car -- to buy the new car three days after the robbery, that's not important. Don't look at that, y'all. Don't look.

Permanentwavesrecords going through the geofence at 5:58 p.m., that's important. But my clients going through the geofence, that's not important. Let's look at why Cobbs's is not in there, Coffman. Let's look at everybody else. There's a dark SUV, a dark sedan, a red pickup that crossed through the geofence. That's important. What about my clients' vehicles? That's not important.

What about Smith's Facebook records that he showed you to open a business? He was already in business is what he said, and he used the Facebook records to corroborate that.

Well, guess what else is in those Facebook records? That 6029 number we've been looking at, it says, "This is my number."

You can't have it both ways.

So what you have to believe to acquit -- and this is all based on their arguments -- that three people borrowed three of their phones, and they all talked to each other, and

they were all at the scene of the robbery, and they took two out of the three of the defendants' cars. And Cobbs was not right that it was a red Hyundai. Coffman wasn't right about the red Hyundai.

And out of 18 people, Coffman, with a one in eighteen shot, he picked the person who just so happened his GPS put him at the scene by satellite -- his phone records, the cell tower put him at the scene, whose girlfriend was the postmaster at Robinsonville and Lake Cormorant, who has a picture in front of the white SUV you see.

Now, we talked about phone communications. And, again, you can go count these to back me up, but this was my rough counting. I just counted each line. And this is what we have, that these people were talking this much between 4:00 and 6:45 p.m. on the day of the robbery.

Jamarr Smith, 19 times with Gilbert McThunel; 18 times with Thomas Ayodele; Chevella Hines, 16 times; Gilbert McThunel, 4 times. Remember -- you see this picture on the right where the white SUV has got -- where he's dropping off? Remember, they were riding together, McThunel and Ayodele. Does this look like a conspiracy to y'all? Talking, same place.

I want you to focus on these times real quick, 5:20 to 5:32. That's when you heard -- that's when the actual robbery occurred. Now, obviously, it was planned way in advance;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right? But this is when the robbery occurred. Twelve minutes. That's pretty good. As we talked about earlier, pretty good. I want you to watch this video. This is one of the animations. Jamarr Smith in yellow, Gilbert McThunel in red, Thomas Ayodele in green. 5:20, 5:22, 5:24, 5:25, 5:26, 5:27, 5:29. And that's it. Jamarr Smith. Let's talk about Jamarr real quick. We've already heard -- this is a picture of him and Chevella Hines. Who's that again? Y'all know it. Postmaster, Robinsonville/Lake Cormorant. This is him in the picture I was talking about earlier in front of the vehicle. This is him with Mr. Thomas Ayodele. This is Jamarr Smith. This is his Facebook records.

"Tried calling you at your other number; so I need to replace it with this one." That's on 2/7/2018. Look at those dates. 2/1, before the robbery -- you've got before and after right there. "What's your number?" "662-360-6029." Who's misleading? Who is misleading y'all? That's -- that's Jamarr Smith's words right there in his records that were just relied on by his attorney.

Next slide, please. Keep going.

Okay. Jamarr Smith right here. This is what we got back from Google right there on the locations.

Go ahead.

There's his four locations.

Next.

This is when -- this is right when he -- I screenshot it. This is right when he met Forest Coffman. You can see Forest Coffman right there on the corner. You can see Jamarr Smith. Obviously, you can't see inside the car, but you can see the same car that he talked about.

Next.

Okay. These were the three Google hits that we got from a satellite GPS.

Click it again.

Now, we talk about accuracy. Now, counsel opposite even said -- Mr. Smith's attorney said during his direct what he said is not evidence, but he even said GPS is accurate. This is the post office where the yellow arrow is. And watch this. Mr. Mims pointed this out, but I really want you to focus on this.

One more, Robin.

That is where Forest Coffman said they met, and it says it on camera. And Jamarr Smith is hitting in a circle that's right there (indicating). So, again, you have to disbelieve that someone picked one out of 18 -- picked him, circled him. And, oh, by the way, his phone put him in a circle right around the area where he said he met him right at the time. Look at these times. 5:22, 5:24, and 5:25.

Again, that's what we talked about, and there's the

Next.

lineup. This is Thomas Ayodele. There's the SUV right there.
This is leaving -- or on the left side of the screen, this is dropping off Mr. McThunel, and then this is after he picked him up leaving the scene. Now, you tell me if that vehicle looks like the same vehicle.

And, again -Next slide.

-- whose phone was there? Oh, I forgot to tell you this. You see Mr. Jamarr Smith standing in front of the Yukon.

Next.

This is Mr. Ayodele's phone records. Now, it's subscribed in his name. It puts him going with them to the scene. Do y'all remember what Patra Malone said? She said she doesn't know anybody in Batesville. So Little Bo? She didn't know who Little Bo was.

So you would have to believe that a phone subscribed in his name was taken by someone and texted with Patra Malone during the time of the robbery, like, right after. It just doesn't -- I'm trying to even think of what you would have to believe, and I can't even do it because it doesn't make sense.

Gilbert McThunel. Seven hits. Seven hits between -remember what I told you -- 5:20 to 5:30. Look at these times.
5:22, 5:24, 5:27, 5:27, 5:28, 5:28, 5:30. There's your circles
that they're supposed to be. There's his travel. Subscribed

in his name. Got his cell phone right there.

Next.

There's the post office.

Next.

This is -- we don't even have to just believe Google. You also got cell towers; right? This is the number he also provided to Kirk. We don't have to just rely on Google, but we can rely on Kirk too. These are his towers -- Lake Cormorant, Walls, and Walls -- pointed down towards Lake Cormorant, if you can see just north of that red flag.

Next.

Last, the red Hyundai Sonata. Now, it may have been an accident, but Mr. Chiniche even said red Hyundai. He said it when he was describing it in the video. Sylvester Cobbs said on the 911 call it's a red Hyundai. Forest Coffman said red Hyundai. Three days later, McThunel sells it, buys another car.

Next.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Two minutes.

MR. McGEE: Thank you.

So, ladies and gentlemen, this thing -- this thing provides a lot of evidence on you. It does. And there's a lot of evidence in this case that you've seen and you've got on the screen. Y'all are smart. I'm not going to pressure you. I'm not going to make you feel guilty and tell you to go -- when

you go to sleep tonight, are you going to feel -- are you going to look up at the ceiling and feel guilty about this or that.

I'm not going to do that to you.

I'm just going to submit to you that I have presented the evidence. I've presented all of the evidence we have. And I would submit that the Government has proved that it connects the dots. But you're a smart jury, and I leave it with you.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. McGee.

So at this time, I'll tell you, Mr. Xxxxx, you have been our alternate. So it's my pleasure -- and probably yours as well -- to excuse you at this time.

Thank you very much for your service. Thank you for being attentive throughout the trial and listening and prepared to step in. And you see why we pick alternates. We lost that alternate the first day; so that's the reason. So we don't have to stop the trial and start all over. Thank you for your service, sir.

(ALTERNATE JUROR NUMBER 2 EXCUSED.)

THE COURT: So what I'm about to do is send you to the jury room to deliberate. Let's talk about some steps between here and there.

First thing is, as soon as I get you out, I'll get the lawyers to come to the table and document by document go through it to make sure all of the exhibits are there and

accounted for. Ms. Tracy will bring you the exhibits, the instructions, a copy of the indictment. You'll have that.

It is typical that, when you first get back there, some may need to go to the restroom, others pick a snack or something; so don't start deliberating until all 12 of you are seated at the table. If during the course of the day you need to take a break, take a break. That's on you.

I've already instructed you you'll pick a foreperson, and that foreperson will be who kind of guides you through your process back there and then speaks for you if need to come back in here.

Because you are now charged with this case, we bring lunch to you so that you don't have to go out and get lunch. That would not be -- in other words, I'm going to keep you in the jury room until we have a decision. So what will happen next when you get back there is a lady will come back and -- with a menu, get your lunch, and that will be ordered for you and brought in.

You certainly don't have to wait on that. You can start deliberating and then take a lunch break, or you can work through lunch. All of this is left up to your discretion once you get in the jury room. It's just important that all 12 of you are participating. Okay?

So I'm going to dismiss you at this time, send you to the jury room. We'll do our business right here and then start

bringing you those documents. I've already indicated to you that if you get ready to see a video or hear an audio and wish some assistance with that, I can make arrangements to get you some assistance to listen.

You're discharged. You are welcome to go to the jury room and start your deliberations.

(JURY OUT AT 12:14 P.M.)

THE COURT: Counselors, if I could get you to come on

THE COURT: Counselors, if I could get you to come on up with Tracy and start going through those exhibits, make sure they're all accounted for.

(RECESSED AT 12:14 P.M.)

(NOTE FROM THE JURY, 3:37 P.M.)

THE COURT: Okay. Let the record reflect that we're back in the courtroom without the jury with all of the attorneys and the parties. We have a question that has been presented by the jury, and for the record, I'll read it into the record. Copies have been provided to you.

It reads, "Confusion on Count 1 between indictment and jury instructions.

"Indictment is a conspiracy charge showing involvement between the defendants. This is not a charge of robbery; correct?

"Conviction of Count 1 is just showing involvement of the count. This is not just the person physically performing the act of robbery. Is our understanding correct?" Signed and dated by, I assume, the foreperson.

So I'll hear first from the Government. We're going to take this kind of in paragraph form. It's a little unusual the way it's being presented to us here between -- Mr. Lewis, I'll pick on you -- whether or not it's a statement or a question.

So that first two lines, "Confusion on Count 1 between indictment and jury instructions," I think is nothing more than him saying this is our problem. Okay? No response needed there.

Next, "Indictment is a conspiracy charge showing involvement between the defendants. This is not a charge for robbery; correct?"

What says the Government as to whether or not to respond and, if so, how?

MR. MIMS: Your Honor, I think we need to respond because they have questions, and I think we need to try to give them some guidance and direction. And in looking at that, I think the appropriate answer or response would be "They are charged with conspiring to commit a robbery." I think that's consistent with Count 1 in the indictment, and it clarifies -- well, I think it clarifies. Who knows? But they're charged with conspiring to commit a robbery.

THE COURT: I want to write your words down.

Okay. You suggest they are charged with conspiracy to

commit a robbery, and I'm going to add -- for discussion 1 purposes, I'm going to preface that by saying "in Count 1." 2 MR. MIMS: Yes, Your Honor. And, really, to be more 3 specific, I guess I should say "the defendants are charged 4 with "instead of "they." 5 **THE COURT:** Okay. So, Counselors, it would read as 6 In Count 1, the defendants are charged with follows: 7 conspiracy to commit a robbery. 8 MR. CHINICHE: Yes, Your Honor. MR. TRAVIS: I have no objection, Your Honor. 10 MR. CHINICHE: Well, I mean, my position is that we 11 don't need a response to the jury and -- other than a note from 12 Your Honor saying the jury instructions and the indictment are 13 there for your benefit. And we -- we would object to 14 responding in anything other than what they've already got. 15 And so --16 THE COURT: 0kay. 17 MR. CHINICHE: -- I think we ought to attach the note 18 that we got from the jury to the trial transcript as well. 19 It will be. It will be part of the 20 THE COURT: transcript. 21 MR. CHINICHE: Yes, Your Honor. 22 And so I think just -- I think the jury has everything 23 that they need because it's pattern jury instructions, and it's 24 the indictment that presumably tracks the statute. And so, 25

therefore, no -- no additional instruction is needed; instead, 1 a directive to read what they've already got in front of them. 2 Thank you. 3 Okay. That's your opinion. THE COURT: 4 Mr. Lewis. 5 MR. LEWIS: Yeah. I agree with that, Your Honor. 6 I'm -- I'm scared to speculate about what they're really asking 7 I don't think I understand the question, I'm sorry to 8 But if their question is does the indictment contain a conspiracy to rob a post office count -- and it's late in the 10 I'm going to go ahead and say this -- Ray Charles afternoon. 11 could read this and see that it contains a conspiracy to rob a 12 post office count. I don't think the indictment is confusing 13 on that; so I don't know why we would need to send that 14 information back in there. 15 MR. McGEE: Your Honor, may we have a moment to --16 THE COURT: Hang on just one second. I also need to 17 hear from Mr. Travis. 18 MR. TRAVIS: May it please the Court. For the sake of 19 20 continuity, Your Honor, I will join in with Mr. Lewis's and Mr. Chiniche's position on behalf of Mr. Ayodele. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. McGEE: Your Honor, this may be a -- let me know 23 when you're ready for me. 24 0kay. I'm ready. THE COURT: 25

2
 3
 4

MR. McGEE: So I -- this -- maybe everybody will agree. I don't know. I read it as, they've looked at the jury instruction that defines robbery, and it gives those elements, and they're getting confused because the indictment says conspiracy.

THE COURT: I think you're right.

MR. McGEE: The next instruction says conspiracy within the conspiracy instruction.

THE COURT: I could say, "You are correct. You're smarter than everybody else in the courtroom, detected this discrepancy."

MR. McGEE: So I -- what I would propose -- and would love to hear from the other side, but what I would propose is that we point them to the conspiracy jury instruction, and I think where they're confused is it says the crime of robbery here, but what I don't think they understand -- I'm sorry.

So I would direct them to this because the conspiracy is the charge, and then the definition of robbery is in the instruction before. And I personally think where they're getting confused is they're looking at this instruction saying, "Wait a minute. This says he's charged -- they're charged with robbery. Do each one of these people have to do this?" But really this is just the definition of robbery with the conspiracy that's -- that's stated in the conspiracy element.

THE COURT: You know what? I mean, that's -- that

Count 2

first paragraph is misleading. The indictment charges the 1 defendants with robbery, and yet we're telling them it's 2 conspiring to commit robbery. 3 Actually, Your Honor, I don't think the MR. MIMS: 4 first paragraph is misleading because that's Count 2. 5 **THE COURT:** Yeah, but it is probably the way I read 6 I'm concerned now that I got them confused in reading 7 --it. 7 and then your other instruction is 8, isn't it, Mr. McGee? The 8 one you first put on the screen is Number 8? MR. McGEE: It's Number 8, yes, ma'am. This is the 10 conspiracy. Now, it does say they are charged with conspiring 11 to rob, but it also doesn't talk about which count is which. 12 think maybe say in Count 1. I don't -- I don't know how adding 13 to a jury instruction -- but that may clear it up. In Count 1, 14 they are charged with conspiring to rob. 15 16 **MR. CHINICHE**: Count 1 is conspiracy to rob. is aiding and abetting in the robbery. 17 THE COURT: Yeah. 18 MR. CHINICHE: And all we're doing in jury instruction 19 20 Number 8 on the screen here is defining what a conspiracy is, and Jury Instruction Number 7 previously defines what robbery 21 is, I believe. 22 **THE COURT:** Okay. I hear your position, defendants, 23 and that was with respect that -- what I'm going to call the 24 second paragraph. Hold on a minute with me, and let's go to 25

```
the second paragraph because we're all in agreement they're
 1
    still talking about Count 1; right?
 2
             MR. MIMS:
                        Yes.
 3
             THE COURT:
                         Yes?
 4
             MR. McGEE:
                          Yes.
 5
                        Okay. I think I understand what they're
             THE COURT:
 6
    asking, and it's a fair concern between the indictment and the
 7
    instructions. I am inclined to respond, in large part, because
 8
    I have found over the years that jurors do not like the fact
    that you tell them they can ask you a question but then you
10
    refuse to respond to their question.
11
              I can -- may I suggest that I take Jury Instruction
12
    Number 8, highlight the second paragraph, respond no further,
13
    and send it back?
14
             MR. CHINICHE:
                            We're okay with that, Your Honor.
15
             MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor.
16
             MR. TRAVIS:
                          That's fine, Your Honor.
17
                         I'm sorry. I'm a little bit confused.
             MR. MIMS:
18
             THE COURT:
                          Take Instruction Number 8 --
19
             MR. MIMS:
                         Okay. Go ahead.
20
                         -- allow me to highlight the second
             THE COURT:
21
    paragraph.
22
             MR. MIMS:
                         This one right here (indicating)?
23
             THE COURT:
                          Yes, sir.
24
             MR. MIMS:
                         Okay.
25
```

THE COURT: Say nothing more and send it back. 1 MR. MIMS: I certainly don't have any objection if 2 that's what the Court wants to do. I have one more suggestion 3 to throw out. And that might be to bring them in, read them 4 Count 1 of the indictment, and then read them the jury 5 instruction that corresponds with conspiracy and then read them 6 Count 2 of the indictment, and read them the jury instruction 7 that corresponds to Count 2 for substantive, plus perhaps 8 aiding and abetting, because those two go to Count 2 and conspiracy goes to Count 1. Or just do it for Count 1 since 10 Count 1 is the one they have questions on. Just read them 11 Count 1 and read them the conspiracy charge in its entirety. 12 MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, with all due respect to 13 Mr. Mims, I've never heard of a jury be reinstructed on the 14 I would object to that. 15 I may have erred, but I've done it before. 16 THE COURT: MR. LEWIS: Okay. Okay. 17 THE COURT: Simply by doing essentially what I'm 18 suggesting, not adding a thing. Simply resubmitting to their 19 20 attention a paragraph. MR. LEWIS: Well, we don't have any objection to you 21 highlighting and sending it back into the jury room. I think 22 what Mr. Mims is asking is something much --23 It is. THE COURT: It is. I understand, but I'm 24

going to try that first. Okay?

25

```
Okay. Here's your question. You go print me
 1
    something I can highlight.
 2
             And I'll let you see it before I send it back, and
 3
    then we will wait.
 4
        (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
 5
             THE COURT: Okay. Tracy, pass that around.
 6
    everybody glance at it and see if it is okay.
7
             MR. McGEE: I'm good with this.
 8
             MR. TRAVIS: Mr. Ayodele approves.
 9
             MR. LEWIS:
                         No objection, Your Honor.
10
             MR. CHINICHE: That's good. Thank you.
11
             THE COURT: Okay. We'll be in recess. Tracy, you may
12
    deliver that to the jury with no comment.
13
        (RECESSED AT 3:51 P.M.)
14
        (OPEN COURT AT 4:00 P.M.)
15
                         It's 4:00. I'm advised that we have a
             THE COURT:
16
    verdict. So you may bring in the jury.
17
        (JURY IN AT 4:01 P.M.)
18
             THE COURT: You may have a seat. Ladies and
19
20
    gentlemen, I see a -- a young gentleman that has a notebook --
    piece of paper in his hand or paper. So I assume we have a
21
    verdict.
22
             JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, ma'am. Your Honor, we do.
23
             THE COURT: You may hand it to the court security
24
    officer.
25
```

So I shall read the verdict as to each defendant. And the Court sees that the form is correct. It has been signed as indicated in the blanks, and it has been -- it has the signature of the foreperson and the date.

I read you as follows: As to Count 1 of the indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant Jamarr Smith guilty. As to Count 2 of the indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant Jamarr Smith guilty.

As to Count 1 of the indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant Thomas Ayodele guilty. As to Count 2, we find the defendant guilty.

As to Count 1 of the indictment, we, the jury, find Gilbert McThunel guilty. As to Count 2 of the indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant McThunel guilty.

Do any of the defendants desire to poll the jury?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you remember that one of your instructions was that the verdict had to be unanimous. So how I determine that is simply asking you, when I call your name, to stand and say -- because there's three defendants, I'm going to make it simple and just say, "Yes, that's my verdict." You heard me read the verdict guilty on both counts to all three. So you don't have to do them one by one. Okay?

1	So, Mr. Xxxx, I'll start with you. Is this your
2	verdict?
3	JUROR: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Xxxxx?
5	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Ms. Xxxxxxxxxx?
7	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Ms. Xxxxxxx?
9	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Mr excuse me. Ms. Xxxxxxxxx?
11	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And Mr. Xxxxxxx?
13	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Xxxxxx?
15	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Ms. Xxxxxx?
17	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Ms. Xxxxxxxx?
19	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Ms. Xxxxxxxxxx?
21	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Xxx?
23	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: And Ms. Xxxxxxxx?
25	JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Are you satisfied, Counselors? 1 MR. CHINICHE: Yes, Your Honor. 2 MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So, ladies and gentlemen, at this 4 time what I'd like to do is thank you publicly in the presence 5 of the lawyers because they're not in a position to do that, 6 but I can assure you that I know they're very, very 7 appreciative of your willingness to listen. You've been very 8 attentive. You've heard a lot of testimony. So thank you. Thank you for your jury service, and thank you for your service 10 in this particular case. 11 I am going to excuse you back to the jury room, and 12 I'll actually come back there. It's my practice to come back, 13 and you can ask me anything you want to ask me at this point 14 because it's over. You get to even go home and talk about it 15 16 tonight if you want to. So I'll come back and answer your questions. 17 I do have some matters I have to take up very briefly 18 with the defendants in the courtroom before I can come back 19 20 there. So be back there shortly. Thank you. (JURY OUT AT 4:05 P.M.) 21 THE COURT: Y'all may have a seat. Consider yourself 22 in recess for just a moment. She's going to get the bond 23 reports.

24

25

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: Okay. So I assume that the defendants 1 want to make bond or continue to make bond? 2 MR. LEWIS: That's correct, Your Honor. 3 So I've just briefly here reviewed all THE COURT: 4 three bond reports, and as to all three, it's recommended that 5 the defendant be released on the same bond with conditions of 6 release continued as to all three. 7 Does the Government have any objection? I do, Your Honor. MR. MIMS: Your Honor, under 18 U.S.C. Code, Section 3143, the 10 standard changes, and it talks about release or detention 11 It says, "The judicial officer shall order pending sentencing. 12 that a person who has been found guilty of an offense be 13 detained, unless the Court finds -- I think it's by clear and 14 convincing evidence, is not likely to flee or pose a danger to 15 16 the safety of any other person or the community if released." The standard changes once they are convicted at trial. 17 We have three defendants convicted of an armed robbery, and 18 despite the fact they may have been on good behavior during 19 20 their pretrial detention, I believe at this point the burden has shifted, things have changed, and they should be detained. 21 **THE COURT:** Can I see your rule book a minute? 22 tell me the number. I can do it right here. 23 What number was it, Mr. Mims? 24 MR. MIMS: Your Honor, it was 3143. And I was reading 25

it a minute ago, and it's got a Subsection A and a Subsection 1 B -- or I'm sorry -- Subsection A, and then it talks about 2 Paragraph 1 and Paragraph 2, and I actually think Paragraph 2 3 applies, but I can't necessarily figure out what the real 4 difference is in the two of them. 5 **THE COURT:** Okay. Mr. Mims, I believe you are 6 Under 3143, it says, "The judicial officer shall 7 order that a person who has been found of an offense and who is 8 awaiting sentence," dah, dah, dah, "be detained, unless the officer finds by clear and convincing evidence that the person 10 is not likely to flee or pose a danger to the community." 11 And then it appears also that 2 may apply -- not 12 apply, I should say. (A)(i), I am not finding at this juncture 13 that a substantial likelihood that a motion for acquittal or 14 new trial will be granted. Neither am I finding that an 15 attorney for the Government has recommended that no sentence of 16 imprisonment be imposed. 17 Because all of you -- Government, you contend this is 18 one year or more? Mr. Mims? 19 20 MR. MIMS: Oh, I'm sorry. THE COURT: I mean, you're not asking for no 21 sentence --22 I'm not. No, ma'am. MR. MIMS: 23 THE COURT: -- or incarceration? And then (B) is 24

where I could find by clear and convincing evidence that the

25

person is not likely to flee or pose a danger to any other 1 So under that condition, I could release. 2 I'm not going to today. I'm going to take them into 3 But I am going to tell you that I think it is custody. 4 probably appropriate at some point to have a hearing under (B). 5 I'm just not doing that today, determining by clear and 6 convincing evidence that they're not likely to flee. 7 So they will be taken into custody. You need to make contact with the marshal service. 9 The tentative sentencing date in this case is 10 May 30th, 2023. 11 Okay. Are there any other matters from the Government 12 for the record? 13 MR. MIMS: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Any other matters for defense counsel for 15 the record? 16 MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, I would just state, as to 17 Jamarr Smith, we are prepared to go forward with a hearing 18 today -- his mother is here -- on this bond issue. 19 words, I can call a witness. Is there some indication of how 20 long they would be confined before hearing? 21 I bet you might file your motion next THE COURT: 22 week, and we will set it as soon as possible. 0kay? 23 That's all I have. MR. LEWIS: 24 THE COURT: Any others? 25

1	MR. TRAVIS: Nothing else, Your Honor. Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Counselors.
3	(CONCLUDED AT 4:13 P.M.)
4	(00.10_02_07.11.10.1.11.1)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

_

CERTIFICATE

I, Phyllis K. McLarty, Federal Official Realtime Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing 1-707 pages, Volumes 1 through 5, are a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Witness my hand, this 31st day of August, 2023

/s/ Phyllis K. McLarty PHYLLIS K. McLARTY, RMR, FCRR, CCR #1235 Federal Official Court Reporter